

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 10, 13-21, 24-25, and 28-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,181,840 by Huang et al. ("Huang") in view of the article Acousto-optic Superlattice Modulator using a Fiber Bragg Grating by Lui et al. ("Lui"). Claims 26- and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Lui, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,430,342 to Kim et al. ("Kim"). Claims 26- and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Lui, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 5,982,963 by Feng et al. ("Feng"). Claims 4, 11, 12, and 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14-28, and 32-35 have been amended. Claims 4, 13, 29, 30, 31, and 37 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 38 and 39 have been added.

Claim 4 has been rewritten into independent form as amended claim 1. As acknowledge in the Office Action, none of the above references, individually or in combination, discloses the limitations in claim 1, as amended. Claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 2, 3, and 5-10 depend on and include the limitations of claim 1, claims 2, 3, and 5-10 are also patentable over the above rejections.

Claim 11 has been rewritten into independent form. As acknowledge in the Office Action, none of the above references, individually or in combination, discloses the limitations in claim 11. Claim 11, as amended, is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 14-26 depend on and include the limitations of claim 11, claims 14-26 are also patentable over the above rejections.

Claim 12 has been rewritten into independent form. As acknowledge in the Office Action, none of the above references, individually or in combination, discloses the limitations in claim 12. Claim 12, as amended, is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 27, 28, 32, and 33 depend on and include the limitations of claim 12, claims 27, 28, 32, and 33 are also patentable over the above rejections.

Claim 37 has been rewritten into independent form as amended claim 34. As acknowledge in the Office Action, none of the above references, individually or in combination, discloses the limitations in claim 34, as amended. Claim 34, as amended, is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 35-36 depend on and include the limitations of claim 34, claims 35-36 are also patentable over the above rejections.

New claim 38 is written in the 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph Six format. The recited structure performs similar functions as stated in claim 11. New claim 38 is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

New claim 39 is written in the 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph Six format. The recited structure performs similar functions as stated in claim 12. New claim 39 is patentable over the above rejections for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the application of the doctrine equivalents. Applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3-24-2004



Thomas S. Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532
Tel.:(408) 720-8300

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026